



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Thus it appears that when Steele began his work there were in existence essays of a type essentially one with that which he was often to write, that Characters had already been used as important factors in the making of a periodical, and that the public demanded this sort of writing. It was, therefore, to the development and popularity of the Character more than to any other one source, that we owe the *Tatler*, and, consequently, the *Spectator*. To know this in no way lessens our admiration for Steele. Out of these materials he made something which needs no word of praise from me. The point is simply that he did have even more in the way of materials than is commonly supposed, that he was not forced to make bricks without an ample supply of straw and a tolerably decent mould.

W. H. DUNHAM.

*The Sheffield Scientific School,
Yale University.*

REVIEWS

The Sounds and History of the German Language, by E. Prokosch, Professor of Germanic Languages in the University of Texas. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1916. v + 212 pp.

Caractères généraux des Langues Germaniques, par A. Meillet, Professeur au Collège de France. Paris: Hachette et Cie., 1917. xvi + 222 pp.

Two distinctive features characterize the plan and structure of these little books, published less than a year apart, which make a simultaneous report upon them not only permissible but even desirable. One consists in the partial similarity of the subject-matter and in the points of contact thus necessitated; the other, and more important circumstance is the tracing in both of tendencies underlying the historical development of the Germanic languages. Professor Prokosch seeks to establish, by means of connected physiological sketches, the essential *unity* of Germanic with the Indo-European parent language. Curiously enough, M. Meillet's endeavors are centered in an attempt to prove the existence of dominating forces which gradually and inevitably brought about a

cleavage between Germanic and the normal ideal of Indo-European dialects.

Prokosch's *Sounds and History* is divided into two parts. 'German Phonetics' is admittedly an adaptation of the books of standard phoneticians, a brief but comprehensive account of fundamental facts, which nevertheless betrays careful thought and planning thruout. Already here the scholar at times gains the upper hand over the pedagogue, and we are treated to sections that are disconcertingly mathematical in appearance and accuracy. Thus, on p. 53, the discussion and chart from Jespersen, designed to indicate the various degrees of sonority, belong rather among the problems of experimental phonetics,—at least as far as the student is concerned. Nor do they relieve the tension created by such a definition of the 'syllable' as "a phonetic unit which is determined by a maximum of sonorousness, and separated from each surrounding unit by a relative minimum of sonorousness." One wonders, too, how far the detailed exposition of Jespersen's Alphabetic system of phonetic transcription, pp. 61-63, which is of such immediate use in advanced study and in the collectanea of new speech-sounds, should find a place and application in a manual dedicated to college students. Aside from these, we have here a carefully graduated introduction to Phonetics, and the circumstance that it has not the *schonende Art* of Sievers, is rather a mark of distinction in its favor. The passages from Trautmann's *Kleine Lautlehre* and Passy's *Petite Phonétique Comparée*, pp. 31-33, quoted to demonstrate that uvular *r* has no place in German (or French) instruction in American schools, is indicative of the general practicalness of the Phonetics.

It is Part Two, *par excellence*, comprising the External History and the Development of Sounds and Forms, which was written with the conscious touch of 'the research magnificent.' It reduces German linguistic evolution to one uniform phonetic principle, and proffers this scientific and pedagogical innovation with the enthusiasm of a discoverer. As a teacher, the reviewer finds it difficult to approve unreservedly the incorporation of untested theories into a work that purports to be a manual for "students without linguistic erudition." Comparative Philology, as a science, is of such protean character that the text-book writer must proceed cautiously with its unsolved problems, lest he play havoc with the credulity

of the beginner. What may be a pleasure to the polemically-minded scientist—the Poetry of the Science—might prove disastrous to the student who is, by common consensus, best reared and nurtured on predigested pabulum. However, *quod non licet bovi licet Jovi*. Professor Prokosch will without fail appeal to his scholarly compeers. His hypotheses, too dogmatic tho they seem without variants or references for immediate class-room use, will stand as a challenge to the retrogressive teacher and a stimulus to further inquiry on his part.

To those who have pursued with interest the author's increasing series of investigations, the new theories do not come as a great surprise. For the present book stands in the constellation of the following articles and notices, 'Forchhammers Akzenttheorie und die germanische Lautverschiebung,' *JEGPh*, XI, 1 ff., 'The Germanic Preterit,' Proceedings, 1913, *PMLA*, 'Sprachwissenschaftliche Ausblicke,' *MPh*, XI, 71, 'Phonetic Tendencies in the Indo-European Consonant System,' *AJPh*, XXXIII, 195, 'Die Stabilität des germanischen Konsonantensystems,' *IF*, XXXIII, 377, and is supplemented by 'Die deutsche Lautverschiebung und die Völkerwanderung,' *JEGPh*, XIV, 1 ff.,—a reading of which will give all the details of the author's viewpoint. Briefly put, there are definite tendencies governing the phonetic evolution of the Germanic languages. These tendencies consist in the strengthening and the weakening of the articulation, and result from the inclination of the Indo-European tribes to extremes in expiration, muscle tension (lips, tongue, vocal chords) and the place of articulation. These tendencies were uniform in the original Indo-European unit, but, after the separation, contact with aboriginal races of different tendencies developed new habits of speech and new phonetic laws. Yet "with those Indo-Europeans who remained in the old home, namely, the Germanic peoples, the old phonetic tendencies continued and led to a remarkably uniform development along definite lines." Accordingly, there was a causal connection between the two Germanic sound-shifts,—the possibility of which Grimm himself admitted,—and the cause itself in both instances is the physiological tendency towards intensification, the reciprocal effect of increased articulation and of muscle tension. The consonant mutations would thus assume the position of two recurrent phases of the same continuous sound-change, just as characteristic of the

Germanic as recurrent palatalization is of the Slavic. This point of view denies all geographical reason to the Second or High German Shift, and even reverses its hypothetical course. Besides this North-to-South direction, there is also assumed a lack of necessity for Scherer's grounds for the shift, viz., a higher civilization meeting a lower one, which has recently been revived by Kauffmann, *ZfdPh*, XLVI, 333. On the contrary, the mixture of races in the general period of the Second Shift did not so much give rise to the latter as originate the High German dialects. The consonant mutation preceded the effects of such a mixture, and the dialects arose because of the weakening of the characteristic tendency to intensification, in accordance with the principle, cf. *JEGPh*, XVI, 5, that in a linguistic confusion consequent upon a migration the old tendencies of linguistic development wholly or partly cease, and even may be supplanted by new tendencies of dissimilar nature.

The extremely adroit handling of the material and especially the physiological arguments hold out a great attraction to the reader. Less convincing is the ethnographic evidence based upon the findings of Bremer and Lamprecht. Granted, however, that the High German mutation is not the result of an influence on the part of a less cultured majority,—altho along with an indubitable Celtic strain in the formation of the vocabulary we must also assume a strong foreign direction in the phonology, and Prokosch himself does not hesitate to employ an occasional reference to such an influence in the later stages of the Shift, cf. *JEGPh*, XVI, 23,—what is there against the theory, since we have no definite cues at our command, that the older, Germanic Shift originated from such an intermingling of races? Celtic itself, with a phonetic 'tendency,' in the direction of aspirated articulation, shows an *analogous* treatment of the explosives, cf. the spirantization of the I.-E. mediae, as well as $c > ch$ (x), $t > th$, $p > ph$ (f), clearly attested, among others, by the Old Norse transcription of Irish names, *Duffpokr* for *Dubthaich*, *Ruðri* for *Rúadri*, the cause of which is just as obscure as of I.-E. $dh >$ Italic p . We have no documentary evidence of the course of the Germanic Shift. We must reconstruct even the Germanic parent language from the testimony of the sister dialects. Even tho both shifts are at bottom essentially similar; even when the Second Shift has been proved to have arisen independently of mountainous surroundings; this brings nothing

ineluctable with respect to Grimm's Law, which may have been formed from just such or any other unknown causes. We conclude that the theory of a uniform Germanic 'tendency' has only a pragmatic, empirical sense; that it is observable in both Consonant Shifts but need not be germoplastically Germanic; that, even if it were part of such a mystic genius of the language, we would still be ignorant of the causes of the tendency itself, when the latter is postulated to be so typically absent from the other Indo-European languages.

The question of an Indo-European home in the North of Europe, with the present denizens as the direct descendants of the aborigines, would indeed receive reciprocal support from such a uniform process in Germanic. As we stand at present, the facts of linguistics, history, archeology and ethnology appear at times hopelessly mingled both in Much and in Hirt, in an attempt to produce a unitary picture, where it is a matter of thousands of years. Proof is needed to show that the Aryan race was at home in Germany during the neolithic period, as well as for the absolute chronological limits of such an occupation. The blond Indo-Germans, born in the North (Wilser, *Die Germanen*, 1904, has since rhapsodized on the origin of *all* progress from the North, including the beginnings of animal life) and still resident about the Baltic, "wo sie sich anscheinend (*sic*) am reinsten erhalten und von wo aus sie ihren stärksten kulturellen und politischen Machteinfluss auf alle Völker der Erde ausgeübt haben" (Much), have still to account for the strong archeological indications pointing toward a home around the Black and Caspian Seas, especially since the discovery of the far-distant Tocharic has rendered the situation even more complicated.

These remarks, I need not stress, are not directed at the author but at the exaggerated conclusions often drawn from the Baltic location of the *Urheimat*. It stands to reason that, independently of this aspect of the case, Prokosch's theory of phonetic unity may be tentatively accepted, and, because of its practicalness, even introduced in advanced instruction, provided it is presented without definite insistence on an uncertain cause and tendency so much as on a workable physiological continuity; the former factors can be modified or disproved by further research. A slightly different interpretation is possible also in the following cases: p. 114, Ver-

ner's Law, where a compromise may be made between the view presented and Lotspeich's theory as to the tension and vibration of the vocal chords, *JEGPh*, xiv, 348. The Qualitative Ablaut, p. 105, receives an explanation which is attractive but metaphysical: the vowel *e* denotes a strong present interest in the speaker, while *o* indicates comparative indifference. Is there not a danger that the actual occurrence of the change of vowels,—altho a fair-sized list can be collected of conditions and qualities with *e*,—has been made the psychological cause of the distinction? We still hold with Brugmann, *Vgl. Gramm.*² I, 482, that "die Entstehung des Ablauts ist in erster Linie ein lautgeschichtliches, nicht ein morphologisch-semasiologisches Problem." In the long run, thus, the qualitative Ablaut may be found to rest on a *Tonentziehung* similar to that of the quantitative. But, for the beginner it is sufficient to know that such variations *exist*. The origin of the Weak Preterite, p. 160, is perhaps too positively put as Brugmann's Pre-Germanic thematic preterite in *-to*. The ultimate solution seems to lie midway between Brugmann and Collitz, both of whom agree on an original dental tenuis in the formans, instead of a *dh*, to the exclusion also of all haplological suggestions. Brugmann's reference to obscure Oscan-Umbrian forms does not decide the matter, especially as he himself questions "dass ausnahmslos jede einzelne form, die zum schwachen präteritum gerechnet wird, diesen und keinen anderen ursprung gehabt habe," *PBB*, xxxix, 95. Attention must therefore be drawn to Professor Collitz's revised view, *MLN*, xxix, 180, which suggests for the source of the preterite forms both the I.-E. perfect middle and the I.-E. simple aorist.

For the rest, the derivation of *Germani*, as the 'prepared, fully armed men' who were sent out in times of over-population, in order to find new homes, cf. the Roman *ver sacrum*, is very ingenious, and by all means more plausible than 'die Echten' which received its exaggerated apotheosis in the patriotic exhortation of Birt, *Preuss. Jahrbücher*, 1915, p. 414.

In connection with a study of the Gēats in *Beowulf*, the reviewer has come across the following explanation of the word Germany by William of Malmesbury which is essentially the same as that offered by Professor Prokosch. Ancient Germany was divided into many provinces and took its name from germinating so many tribes. "As the pruner cuts off the more luxuriant branches of the tree to

impart a livelier vigor to the remainder, so the inhabitants of this country assist their common parent by the expulsion of a part of their members, lest she should perish by giving sustenance to too numerous an offspring; but in order to obviate the discontent, they cast lots who shall be compelled to migrate. Hence the men of this country made a virtue of necessity, and when driven from their native soil have gained foreign settlements by force of arms." (*Chronicle*, ed. Giles, I, cl.) The idea of "germination" is naturally fanciful, but evidence would point to the same custom with reference to the Vandals, Goths, Lombards and Normans, all of whom the chronicler mentions, as well as to the legend of Hengest and Horsa. In all likelihood William here harks back to an old Germanic tradition still current in England in the twelfth century. As to Hengest, compare Maerlant's lines (quoted from Bosworth, *Origin of the English, German and Scandinavian Languages*, p. 52.)

Ein hiet Engistus een Vriese een Sas
Die vten lande verdruen was.

The theories concerning the German *Umlaut*, the evolution of the High German standard idiom, the essentially aoristic character of the strong preterite, as well as the novel aspect of the optative, are also extremely suggestive and in keeping with the general stimulating atmosphere of the work which, but for its few controversial drawbacks, will prove a real treat to those whom it is intended to reach.—We should like to add to the bibliography, with special application to p. 79, fn., Leon Dominian's *The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe*, New York, 1917, which contains very accurate details of the geographical boundaries of the German linguistic territory.

M. Meillet's treatise is not a school manual, but an investigation with a set purpose, like Jespersen's *Progress in Language, With Special Reference to English*, to which indeed we can discover an unexpected dissimilarity. "On n'a pas cherché," we are told in the engagingly written *Avertissement*, "à expliquer tous les faits de la phonétique et de la grammaire, mais seulement à faire ressortir les innovations qui ont donné au groupe germanique un aspect spécial." In other words, the aim of the book is not to show how the Germanic languages can be explained from the Indo-European elements which Comparative Grammar has disclosed, but to gather

proofs of originality on the part of the Germanic dialects. The three chapters comprising the work, one each on Phonetics, Morphology and Vocabulary, seek to bring out the following thesis: Pre-Germanic, composed almost entirely of I.-E. constituents, already contains the germs of a new *system*. Its historical evolution into the various Germanic dialects offers evidence of increased differentiation from the *Ursprache*. German, albeit the most conservative of the groups, nevertheless has a grammar altogether unlike the I.-E. grammar, and a vocabulary penetrated by strange words or by new values of old words. And, where historical circumstances hastened the development, hardly anything remained of the Indo-European *type* of language. Thus, English and Danish, despite the preservation of some features, are linked to Indo-European solely by the fact of genetic provenience; there is but little in them of the original basic qualities.

Telling facts are interestingly massed and co-ordinated to bear on this proposition. And, if the author had purposed a sketch of the simplification of Indo-European in its transition to Germanic, from the rigid synthetic stage to the supple analytic type, or enumerated the more peculiar innovations commonly found in those dialects, his book would be a contribution, not indeed altogether novel in substance, but authoritative in point of view. His *interpretation* of the changes, however, is so strangely motivated that, with a *jeu de mot* on Jespersen, it might be entitled *The Germanic, With Special Reference to Decay in Language*. For, while Meillet, too, operates with the concept of 'tendency,' his active principles of innovation are not conservative and conducive to essential unity, but radical and deteriorative. These passages might well be encountered in the pages of Prokosch, "We very often limit ourselves to ascertaining that at such a stage of Indo-European development a given language will respond with a different condition. But the changes that occur result almost always from large tendencies. These tendencies are active before they become manifest, and continue to exert their influence for a long time after their appearance," (page 2), . . . "for a part at least the tendencies considered continue to act up to the present time" (page 3). But Meillet's tendencies are those of destruction. The ancient morphology—we quote from various parts,— "est détruite"; on account of the recessive, fixed accent "la phrase germanique est violemment mar-

telée" and the final syllables undergo a "mutilation"; all of which "tendaient à ruiner" the Indo-European system, brought about "la dégradation des finales," etc., so that, if one considered the English of to-day and, forgetting its past, tried to demonstrate that it was an Indo-European language, he would not succeed (page 17).

The fallacy of this line of argument is patent. Any book on *Urgermanisch*, cf. Streitberg or Kluge, will yield material for a treatise wherein it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that Germanic has retained sufficient of the Indo-European structure not to be outlawed because of such progressive alterations. "Une prononciation neuve, une grammaire neuve"! Of what modern I.-E. idiom can this not be said? There is in all a general reduction of finals and a simplification of grammar. Germanic has never suppressed the intervocalic consonants even to the extent of French or Portuguese, whereby very often in the latter the Latin words became absolutely unrecognizable. Intensity of initial accent can be found in Celtic where it gave rise to similar reduction of atonic syllables. The vowels of final syllables are affected in Latin and Balto-Slavic. And so on. Is it not merely a question of degree and not of kind?—One receives the impression, moreover, that Meillet is distressed to see the loss of the original eight case-forms, of the dual and of the medial. Granted, then, that the Germanic preserved the dual up to a time when not the Latin, Greek nor Sanscrit possessed it. That to him passes off as "un archaïsme." He laments the fact that Germanic has not kept more distinct the I.-E. categories of the noun-inflection. Yet he seems piqued to discover not only the traces but even extensions of the ablaut types (page 109)! For once, it would seem, M. Meillet's fine linguistic sense has been deflected into unwonted channels and drawn into a *cul de sac*.

It is instructive to see Meillet's conception of the Second Sound Shift as a continuation of the first change of the articulatory type, "reprise partielle de phénomènes de la première mutation" (page 42), because, despite phonological differences, he is in agreement there with some of the views we have studied in Prokosch. The cause of the initial tendency, however, is given here definitely as the influence of a subjugated majority upon a more cultured minority,—the cause of *all* the tendencies of *all* the subsequent changes (pp. 19, 74, etc.). His version of this condition of affairs

is that Germanic was from the Indo-European period spoken by a different non-Aryan population. When conquered by the I.-E. tribe, this inferior but more numerous people adopted the new tongue that was destined to become the Germanic which we know, but retained its own type of articulation. It is impossible to tell from the paucity of the information which M. Meillet vouchsafes how he pictures this racial mixture to have taken place. It is reminiscent of Tomaschek's view, embodied in Feist's first book, *Kultur, Ausbreitung und Herkunft der Indogermanen*, Berlin, 1913, according to which the Pre-Germans, or the ancestors of the Germani, were Indo-Germanized by the culturally superior Celts; the identity of the Germans with the Indo-Germans is to be rejected; Germanic is not the direct descendant of any I.-E. dialect. However, in the only work of Feist which Meillet mentions, *Indogermanen und Germanen*, Halle, 1914, this Celtic theory is recanted in favor of one which holds that the Indo-Germanization of Northern Europe was effected before the Celtic expansion by an obscure I.-E. race that spoke an Italo-Celtic idiom which was accepted by the *Urvolk* for its own. Both Feist and Meillet are nebulous as to prehistoric interpretation. The hypothesis of racial mixture, however, need not be incontinently rejected. A conquered and less civilized majority may determine the phonetic conditions of a new language, as against the semantic contribution of the minority (Wundt, *Elemente der Völkerpsych.*, p. 58); also, in case we imagine the superior Germani to have been the more numerous, change of phonetic tendency may still take place because of the racial contact (Prokosch, *JEGPh*, xvi).

There are but two ways of explaining the *analogous* Armenian, Celtic and Italic consonant mutation or the scarcely accidental expiratory initial accent of Celtic, Italic and Germanic, cf. Hirt, *IF*, ix, 284: acquired characteristics thru racial contact or surviving remnants of Indo-European tendency. The latter would be hard to prove concerning the intensified fixed accent.

The last section of the book, on the Germanic vocabulary, is embarrassingly unconvincing, coming as it does from the pen of an authoritative linguist. According to Meillet, who seeks to find everywhere the magic touch of transmutation, the connection between *zucht* and *ziehen* is no longer felt. "The Germanic words appear isolated and not grouped around roots . . . there are no more families of words comprising at once nouns and verbs freely

grouped about the same root" (page 199). What would he call *winden*, *Gewinde*, *Windung*, *Windel*, *windig*, *Gewand*, *Wandel*, *wandeln*, *wandelbar*, *wandern*, *Wanderung*, *Wanderschaft*, *überwinden*, *wenden*, *gewandt*, *Wende*, *(Braten)wender*, *auswendig*, *Notwendigkeit*, etc., etc? And how many languages could stand the following rigid test, as a condition *sine qua non* of retaining membership in the Indo-European community, "Si par hasard on manquait de toute donnée traditionnelle sur le vocabulaire germanique, on serait bien embarrassé pour expliquer même les plus archaïques des textes germaniques en s'aidant seulement d'un dictionnaire étymologique des anciennes langues indo-européennes" (page 206).

We are obliged to conclude that Professor Meillet's theory to the effect that the specifically Germanic innovations spell such decisive deterioration as will effectually read their dialects out of the Indo-European system of languages, has for the nonce left him face to face with an extremely disconcerting *impasse*.

ALEXANDER GREEN.

The Johns Hopkins University.

The 'Ad Deum Vadit' of Jean Gerson. Published by DAVID HOBART CARNAHAN, from the manuscript Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Fr. 24841. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. III, No. 1). Urbana, 1917. Pp. 155.

Jean Gerson, the "Doctor Christianissimus," is a mere name to most students of French literature. His sermons, perhaps the most remarkable preached in France in the later Middle Ages, are accessible only in rare and unsatisfactory editions. A case in point is the *Ad Deum Vadit*, his sermon on the Passion, preached before the French court in 1402. Hitherto we have had a bad Old French text of 1507, an inaccurate Latin translation of 1515 (thrice reprinted), and an inadequate modern French version of 1874. Professor Carnahan consequently deserves our gratitude for his careful edition of the sermon. It is now easy to form an idea of Gerson from one of his most typical discourses. The reader who does so feels that the *Ad Deum Vadit* is the utterance of a great soul. It has power and life. Despite *longueurs* and